too, are known to us to such an extent that we may gather how the Romans saw the position of man in relation to the world and society. It would be possible to continue for several pages; I shall not do that. But what I have already said might justify the opinion that our knowledge of the Romans in general and the educated Romans in particular is sufficiently deep and broad to make it possible to apply the method. Let us, then, try on the basis of this knowledge to find out how and why the *Metamorphoses* did find favour with its readers – or in other words: what kind of poem the *Metamorphoses* were in that age.

PART ONE: THE CONTEXT

II

The literary Context

The study of literary sources and models is mainly pursued in order to investigate the genesis of a poem. Here we shall be concerned with such studies from our own point of view. It was maintained that the poet himself might be regarded as the first reader of his poem, although in some respects a very atypical one. The reason why it might prove profitable to start with Ovid himself is that, thanks to the study of the sources and models of the *Metamorphoses* and Ovid's other poems, we know something about his literary background. Like Vergil and Horace he was a voracious reader whose creative power was nourished by books as we know from statements made in the poems written during his exile [1]; such statements are fully confirmed by his work. Probably, he read more than most of his contemporaries; but Ovid was not, for all we know, an outsider in matters of taste. On the contrary, he openly admitted his happiness about having been born into an age characterized by *cultus* [2]; and he carefully informs the reader that by this term he does not understand the display of wealth but the grace and elegance of the Roman intellectual aristocracy to which he belonged. An essential feature of this refined *cultus* was literary education; in his Lectures on Love Ovid instructs his undergraduate that he must study the *ingenuae artes* and thoroughly learn both languages [3], and he recommends a large *pensum* of poetry, ranging from Anacreon to himself but including the *Aeneid,* which cannot be termed an exclusively erotic poem [4]; besides, it is evident that the third book of *Ars amatoria,* meant to be read by women, presupposes that its readers actually know both Greek and Latin literature to no little extent. Moreover, unlike many modern poets Latin poets did not address their poems directly to the anonymous public. The process of publication had an intermediate stage, where the poet read his poem or the finished parts of it to a selected audience representing the qualified public. Often, his friends or members of his *cercle littéraire* were being directly involved in the making of the poem by their criticisms, directions,

or suggestions, in much the same way as Atticus is often consulted by Cicero about literary problems. The implication of this intimate interplay between poet and the first readers—or rather listeners—is that their tastes and their literary background must have been to some degree the same. So it seems reasonable to suppose that although Ovid, *qua* poet of the *Metamorphoses,* was an atypical reader of that poem, his reading and background in general was typical of his readers, too – except, perhaps, for the quantity.

We shall distinguish between literary sources and literary models, defining sources as the works where the poet has found his subject-matter and models as the works which the poet was "imitating" (to be taken in the sense of the Latin concept of *imitatio).* Source and model may often be identical, the typical example of this being translations or adaptations. From our point of view the models are by far the most important category; it made little or no difference to the reader's understanding and appreciation whether or not he knew in what mythological handbook Ovid had found a certain story or from what mythographer he took, say, the names of Actaeon's dogs.

It appears from Probus' commentary on Vergil's *Georgica* I, 399 that Ovid used Nicander's Ἑτεροιούμενα as a source and this is confirmed by the extracts made by Antoninus Liberalis from that and other poems. There are, however, different opinions concerning the problem whether Nicander was a model for Ovid, too. Judging by the extant works of Nicander, the *Theriaca* and the *Alexipharmaca,* with their perverse and obscure language and—to our ears at any rate—unpleasant style, Ovid has not followed the Ἑτεροιούμενα in this respect. But he may have used Nicander as a model of composition to some degree. This view is held by scholars as Lafaye [5], Bethe [6], Castiglioni [7], Vollgraff [8], Martini [9], and Kraus [10], but refused among others by Wilamowitz [11], Laudien [12], Kroll [13], and Otis [14]. But as we have only a few fragments and Antoninus Liberalis' disconnected extracts of the poem, the problem may always be open to discussion. All scholars, however, agree that the chronological principle of the *Metamorphoses* was invented by Ovid, the basis of this assumption being the general feeling that this kind of grand design was not consistent with the hellenistic collective poem rather than any actual evidence. Probably, the guiding principle—if any at all—in the Ἑτεροιούμενα was geography; it was a kind of mythological periegesis, restricted to metamorphoses. Nevertheless, it is beyond doubt that Ovid's knowledge of Nicander did have a certain influence on the making of the poem. It is *a priori* probable that Ovid's readers—or at

least the more cultivated among them—knew Nicander's poem, too; fortunately in this case, we are not reduced to an *a priori* probability, a poor thing in itself. Although Nicander's poems are almost intolerable to modern readers they were held in a certain esteem by the Romans, a fact which serves as a good illustration of the fickleness of literary taste. So Cicero, whose acceptance of the neotetic movement was not without some reservation [15], mentions—or, to be correct, introduces Crassus mentioning—Nicander along with the universally admired Aratus and characterizes his *Georgica* as an excellent poetical achievement [16]. It is certain that Vergil knew Nicander [17] and highly probable that he borrowed something more than the title from him, nor does it look like a pure coincidence that the *Georgica* of Vergil contains a book on bees, corresponding to the Μελισσουργικά of Nicander.

Another member of the Maecenean circle, Aemilius Macer from Verona, who was also an acquaintance of the young Ovid, made a translation or rather an adaptation of Nicander's *Theriaca,* which was later used by Lucan in his description of the Libyan snakes. We know from Ovid [18] that Macer also wrote a didactic poem on botany; judging by Ovid's comments he especially emphasized the pharmacological qualities of certain plants; here, too, he probably drew upon Nicander. Ovid's friend seems to have liked the didactic genre very much; he translated or adapted the Ὀρνιθογονία of a certain Boios, if that is the real name of the author. This poem was apparently among the sources of the *Metamorphoses.* The possible and probable relations between the *Metamorphoses* and Macer's Latin version of Boios cannot be determined, as nothing is left of Macer's poem. But birds, in fact, are very frequent in the *Metamorphoses* [19]. Ovid himself once began to put recipes into verse, and, although it was not the province of medicine but that of cosmetics he wanted to conquer, the whole idea of this *tour de force* (which, apparently, he soon gave up) is Nicandrean. Both the *Ars* and the *Remedia* are—among many other things—burlesques of didactic poetry, a fact which bears witness to the general popularity of this genre, in which Nicander had a prominent place. Towards the end of his life in order to escape the boredom of his exile Ovid began to compose a didactic poem on fish, the *Halieutica.* Some generations later we learn from Quintilian that Nicander was among the Greek poets whom cultivated persons were supposed to know—at least as a name [20]. So, it would seem that the poems (whether or not they may be dignified by the name [21]) of Nicander (whether or not he was the most tasteless of all Greek poets [22]) were among the books generally accepted and admired by Roman readers. The story about the

daughters of Orion on Alcon's crater [23] may serve as an illustration of the interplay between Ovid and Nicander. Here, as it appears from Antoninus Liberalis [24], Ovid follows closely Nicander's fourth book of *the Ἑτεροιούμενα up to a certain point: the girls kill themselves with* their peaceful tools in order to avert a plague from Thebes. At this point of the story Nicander made Hades and Persephone transform the dead bodies into stars and stated that every year the Boeotians held a feast where κόροι and κόραι presented them with propitiatory offerings; accordingly, they were called κορωνίδες. Ovid, apparently not primarily interested in this piece of aetiology, gives the metamorphosis a new meaning: the girls gave themselves, he writes, a *non femineum vulnus* and as a consequence were transformed into young *men*. Then he changed their name to the masculine *Coroni* with the conventional epic formula *quos fama Coronos nominat*. To those of Ovid's readers who were familiar with Nicander there would be the irony that *fama* here is Ovid and nobody else [25].—Some few verses later [26], Ovid briefly alludes to the quarrel between the gods about Ambracia in a way which seems to indicate that this story, which is told by Nicander [27], was already known to his readers.

The conclusion to be drawn is that Nicander was not only one of Ovid's many models for the *Metamorphoses,* but also a model of his readers— or some of them—for the appreciation of the poem. I am aware that here I introduce a novel use of the word model, and some explanations might not be out of place. By the term "model of reading" should be understood any literary work which is felt by the reader to have a relation to the work he is reading, whether this is intended by the author or not, i. e. whether or not it has been a "model of writing"; but as *imitatio* (μίμησις) is an essential feature of ancient literature, and as ancient readers always tried to recognize the *imitationes,* they would normally regard all the works they found to be related to the work they were reading as having been intentionally used by the poet as models of writing (provided of course that the work was later in time than those "imitated"). And it should be noted that not only similarities but also differences in content or form are included in *imitatio;* further, *imitatio* may range from a single association of detail to a fundamental relation permeating the work, the extreme case being a translation; finally, *imitatio* in this sense does not imply any value judgment: the "imitation" is not necessarily inferior to the work "imitated". So, among many other works, the *Annals* of Ennius were a "model of reading" for the *Aeneid*—besides being, of course, one of Vergil's "models of writing". But once the *Aeneid*

had come into existence, that poem became a "model of reading" f(the *Annals*. After the *Aeneid* it was impossible to read the *Annals* in th same way as before the *Aeneid,* and, eventually, the *Annals* were eclipse *as the national epos of Rome.*

Among the hellenistic didactic poets there were other models of readin for the *Metamorphoses* than Nicander. The archegetes of this genre, Aratus was known and admired by Ovid and his readers but there seems to be littl correspondence between the *Phaenomena* and the *Metamorphoses.* Th *Hermes* of Eratosthenes, probably a hymn in the Callimachean manner contained a passage on constellations and their myths, astronomy, and th zones of the world. The poem was known to Vergil who translates a passage in the *Georgica* [28]. And as literary astronomy was among th fashionable interests of the educated Romans of this age, Eratosthene is likely to have been read by some of them. The so called *Catasterisms* which may go back to Eratosthenes, were among the sources of Ovid' *Fasti.*

But far more important for the *Metamorphoses* than these didacti poets was the son of Battus, both as a model of writing and a model o reading. It is not necessary here to demonstrate in detail his enormou influence on Roman poets [29] and we may be sure that if a Roman really wanted to be regarded as competent in literary matters, the work of Callimachus were indispensable. The plan of Propertius to manifes himself as the Roman Callimachus, as Vergil had become the Roman Homer, was baffled by his premature death, and it was left to Ovid to fill the gap in Roman literature. Apparently, he felt equal to the task— and more than that: he frankly declared himself to be superior to hi great predecessor; this is the implication of the famous couplet:

> *Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe:*
> *quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet* [30].

It is not easy to tell what exactly Ovid meant by *ingenium* [31], a quality he often claims to be in possession of; probably it corresponds to our vague notion of "inspiration", a kind of "enthusiasm" penetrating the work or, in other words, the quality which distinguishes the *vates* from the *poeta*. Ovid's self-assurance—which is not, be it noted, uncallimachean —may have irritated some of his ancient readers as it evidently irritates Wilkinson [32]; others may have accepted it as a truth. In any case so much may be deduced from Ovid's attitude that he did probably not want his readers to regard the *Metamorphoses* as a Callimachean poem and nothing else; there were many other models, and to those readers who

were familiar with Callimachus this would be evident. It has often been pointed out that the *Aetia* of Callimachus is a model of the *Metamorphoses* and that Ovid linked his episodes in a manner rather like that of Callimachus; it should not, however, be forgotten that there is frequently a considerable difference between the formal and very often superficial connection and the "real" connection between the episodes in the *Metamorphoses.* The poem can be read as a discontinuous *pot-pourri* of narratives, but, and that is very important, it can also be read as a single narrative whole. Brooks Otis [33] may very well be right in saying that Ovid himself would have said that that was the way it should be read.

That Ovid knew, and presumed that his readers knew Callimachus is evident from his imitation of Callimachus' *Hecale* in the *Philemon and Baucis*; this claim may be substantiated by some detail: Callimachus' *Hymn to Diana* is imitated by Ovid when he makes Daphne refer to the model:

> *"Da mihi perpetua, genitor carissime", dixit*
> *"virginitate frui! Dedit hoc pater ante Dianae"* [34]

and when he makes the cyclops, who is in love with Galathea, recommend himself in terms reminiscent of the description of the cyclopes in Callimachus where the delicate nymphs are scared by their monstruous appearance [35]. In Ovid's description of Echo's fatal passion we find the words

> *vox tantum atque ossa supersunt* [36].

This may be compared with an epigram by Callimachus about a young man reduced by his love to a miserable condition:

> Θεσσαλικὲ Κλεόνικε τάλαν τάλαν, οὐ μὰ τὸν ὀξὺν
> ἥλιον, οὐκ ἔγνων· σχέτλιε, ποῦ γέγονας;
> ὀστέα σοι καὶ μοῦνον ἔτι τρίχες [37].

This is the normal Greek phrase, translated by Plautus into *ossa ac pellis* [38]. The relation to Callimachus [39] underlines the variation made in the *Metamorphoses:* Echo is the person in question here.

Two other great names of hellenistic literature would occur to the Romans when reading the *Metamorphoses,* Apollonius Rhodius and Theocritus. Callimachus' harsh criticism of the former did not prevent him from finding readers in Rome; he appears to have been among Vergil's models for the *Aeneid,* especially in the fourth book, and was translated by Varro Atacinus. His popularity with the Roman readers seems to have continued through the first generations of the imperial age, as he was the model of Valerius Flaccus. The reader must have recognized much of the spirit of Apollonius in the *Metamorphoses;* apart from Ovid's passage on Medea, where, obviously, Apollonius is one of the chief models in both senses, the contrast between the epic tone and the rationalistic treatment, the heroic and the sentimental is a constituent feature of both poems. Direct loans seem to be comparatively seldom [40]. That Theocritus was the model of Ovid's story of Galathea and the Cyclops would be evident to every well-read reader [41], but there are many other "idyllic" and "bucolic" passages in the *Metamorphoses* which are more or less reminiscent of Theocritus. A detail is found in Ovid's tale about Narcissus who in his despair beats his naked breast and

> *pectora traxerunt roseum percussa ruborem*
> *non aliter quam poma solent, quae candida parte,*
> *parte rubent, aut ut variis solet uva racemis*
> *ducere purpureum nondum matura colorem* [42].

And the sight of this in the mirror of the pond is too much: Narcissus melts away. His loved one becomes beautiful as the god of love himself: Theocritus has the apostrophe:

> ὦ μάλοισιν Ἔρωτες ἐρευθομένοισιν ὁμοῖοι [43].

But the reader of the *Metamorphoses* was not only constantly reminded of the Alexandrines [44]; Ovid came after Vergil and Horace, the classics and classicists, and so his readers were accustomed to look for references to and influence from the older Greek literature from Homer and onwards. As practically every narrative poem after Homer was deeply influenced by him in various ways it is often difficult to see whether the poet is actually imitating an imitation of Homer or Homer himself; this is an important problem, if we ask how the *Metamorphoses* were made; but when the question is how the poem was read—or could possibly have been read—it does not really matter. The famous simile in Homer's Battle of the Ships, where the Trojan assault on the Greek ships is compared with that of the waves on a ship in a gale, is imitated by both Apollonius [45] and Vergil [46]. Ovid [47] may have borrowed it from one of these; but in any case a large number of readers would compare Ovid's simile with Homer's if that was the one which came first to mind; few would

remember Apollonius and forget about Homer, but readers with little or no Greek would recall Vergil; in this particular case all readers would arrive at almost the same understanding of the simile's relation to the model, the point being, as observed by Otis [48], the reversal of the application; readers who did not remember any of the models would appreciate the simile according to its intrinsic qualities.

Another example where the essence of the Homeric imitation in the *Metamorphoses* is variation can be found in the story about Jupiter and Semele. Juno, disguised as Beroë [49], Semele's nurse, is luring the girl into asking Jupiter to visit her in all his canonicals:

> *quantus . . . et qualis ab alta*
> *Iunone excipitur, tantus talisque, rogato*
> *det tibi complexus suaque ante insignia sumat* [50].

The *ingénue* is easily persuaded. The reader knows, of course, in advance that this will end with a catastrophe, but still he is somewhat puzzled as he would remember the famous passage in the fourteenth *Iliad* where Zeus and Hera make love to each other; and that is an entirely peaceful and gay scene. In the *Metamorphoses* erotic intercourse between the King and Queen of the gods seems to be a more violent affair. Jupiter, forced by his oath to fulfil his promise, goes to the *aether* in a very sad mood:

> *vultuque sequentia traxit*
> *nubila, quis nimbos immixtaque fulgura ventis*
> *addidit et tonitrus et inevitabile fulmen.*

Perhaps some readers remembered that in Homer Zeus is actually characterized as νεφεληγερέτα when Hera discovers him on Mount Ida [51], and, further, he actually gathers a cloud during their making love—but a *golden* one, whose ingredients must have been considerably different from those in Ovid.—As Jupiter had to appear to Semele in the same *habitus* as to Juno, the thunderbolt was certainly an inevitable requisite [52]. But he took a *fulmen* of a smaller caliber; the very existence of this is an Ovidian *concetto,* but it is introduced in a Homeric manner; as is the case with a number of things in Homer, it bears a special name among the gods [53]. It should be noted, however, that whatever may be the explanation of Homer's language of the gods, it does not contain any designation that can be paralleled to the utterly prosaic *tela secunda* [54].

The following example shows Ovid displaying his learning in the manner of the Alexandrines. King Anius gives the Troians gifts as befits heroes

from Homer to Vergil. Anchises received a sceptrum, Julus a *chlamys* and a quiver, but Aeneas a *crater* [55],

> *quem quondam transtulit illi*
> *hospes ab Aoniis Therses Ismenius oris.*
> *Miserat hunc illi Therses, fabricaverat Alcon* [56]
> *Hyleus et longo caelaverat argumento.*

The reader familiar with the history of art would note that Alcon was the name of a most famous *toreutes* from Hellenistic times. And the readers who knew their Homer in detail would find it extremely appropriate that he came from Hyle as Tychias the σκυτοτόμος who made Ajax' shield [57] did. And those who were well-informed about geography in Homer would find it quite natural that a Hylaean chose a Boeotian theme [58]. Observe, however, that the learning does not make the passage esoteric. Less intellectual readers might enjoy the melodious play of Greek names and the playful σπονδειάζων which underlines the adjective *longo*.—But Homer would be a model of reading not only in cases of close imitation or special allusions but also in a varying degree throughout the whole poem, simply because the *Metamorphoses* was an epic poem and Homer was *the* epic poet [59].

However, no reader would think that the *Metamorphoses* was an epic poem in the Homeric sense of the word. For Ovid's Alexandrine predecessors the problem about models to choose seems to have been focused on the alternatives of choosing Homer or Hesiod, this being one of the major elements of the literary dispute between the Callimachean and the Apollonian schools. The readers who were familiar with this dispute would note that in precisely the same way as both Callimachus and Apollonius were models of the *Metamorphoses,* so Hesiod was a model along with Homer. There were many models of the *Ages of the World* but Hesiod was the first and probably the most famous. And although readers would see that the medium of Hesiodic influence in the *Metamorphoses* had very often been Alexandrine poets as Aratus or Callimachus himself, they would be aware that in poetry systematic mythology, catalogues, episodes, aetiology, and didacticism were—to speak as the ancients themselves—inventions of the Ascraean. As for subject-matter the Hesiodic poems are often direct or indirect sources of the *Metamorphoses* [60]. The fact that Ovid proceeds from Chaos and Creation to amours between gods and mortals can hardly be ascribed to Hesiodic influence. It was an inevitable consequence of his idea to write a poem *ab origine mundi ad sua tempora,* and thus no source is needed to account for it. But the existence of the Hesiodic pre-

cedence—the *Eoeae* were supposed to follow the *Theogonia* without a break—and the fact that it was familiar to the Augustans would not make Ovid's procedure surprising in the eyes of his readers [61].

Despite his veneration for the old adaptations of Greek tragedies by Naevius, Ennius, Accius, and Pacuvius, Cicero had by his own translations of selected passages from the Greek tragedians demonstrated the possibility of forming a Roman tragic style which was more in harmony with contemporary literary standards than the archaic tragedies. In a letter [62] Cicero assures his brother that as a poet he was superior to himself; if this statement is based upon sound criticism rather than upon fraternal loyalty, we have some reason to regret the loss of the tragedies of Quintus Cicero; however, the fact that once during the campaign in Gallia he finished four tragedies within sixteen days is apt to arouse certain doubts. In the Augustan age tragedy had a considerable vogue. We learn from Suetonius [63] that the Emperor himself made an attempt in this genre; the fact that he finally killed his *Ajax* by the sponge probably need not cause much regret from a literary point of view. Horace in his *Ars Poetica* tried to call forward a renascence of Roman tragedy. Both Asinius Pollio and Varius wrote tragedies and according to Quintilian [64] the *Thyestes* of the latter, perhaps together with Ovid's *Medea,* could match the Greek masterpieces. There were other tragic poets too like Turrannius and Gracchus, and it appears from a passage in Horace [65] that the melodramatic tragedies of Pupius were performed with success. We may conclude, then, that the readers of the *Metamorphoses* were familiar with tragedy and that at least those among them who were reasonably well educated knew the Greek originals. So tragedy was a model of reading for the *Metamorphoses* as it had been a model of writing, too. Apparently Ovid himself gave the price to Sophocles among the three great tragedians; he once used his name to represent the whole genre [66]. Nevertheless it would sooner be Euripides who presented himself to the reader as a model of the *Metamorphoses.* The reasons why are well explained by Lafaye: "Il y a dans les drames d'Euripide une unité beaucoup moins forte que dans ceux d'Eschyle et de Sophocle; il est d'autant plus facile d'en extraire des scènes qui se suffisent à elles-mêmes. Il excelle à exprimer les sentiments de l'humanité moyenne; par la il fournit souvent le modèle de scènes familières, ou les héros de la fable parlent un language à la fois simple et pathétique. Il fait à l'amour une place considérable dans son théâtre; enfin il aime à preter à ses personnages des discours contradictoires qui rappellent les luttes du barreau: autant de traits que nous retrouvons dans les Métamorphoses" [67]. As demonstrated by Lafaye the

Euripidean influence has often passed through Alexandrine mediums in the creative process of the *Metamorphoses.* But here again this problem may be dismissed as comparatively unimportant from our point of view: in a certain sense all literary works are contemporary: in their presence in the mind of the reader; and people would recognize Euripidean spirit when they saw it even if the author was not directly imitating Euripides. However, readers who knew both Euripides and his Alexandrine imitators would enjoy the interplay and multilateral variations of models. No qualified ancient reader would ever get the idea that literary works were or should be regarded as autonomous entities; the whole allusive character of Roman literature makes it evident that authors and readers were in complete agreement that very essential parts of the literary structure—to use the modern term—were centred in the relations of the work with other works. Lafaye's statement, quoted by many scholars: "De toutes les métamorphoses donc nous sommes témoins dans le poème d'Ovide, celle qu'il a fait subir à ses modèles n'est certainement pas la moins étonnante" is not only an elegant *tour* but also true of the nature of ancient literary appreciation.

As the *Metamorphoses* challenged the reader's knowledge of Greek literature, so the poem offered rich possibilities of recognizing Roman models as well. Unfortunately, the question of Ovid's relations to older and contemporary Roman literature has not attracted the interest of scholars in the same measure as his Greek models. And I quite agree with M. v. Albrecht [68] when he draws attention to the fact that too little attention has been paid to these problems.

It is easy to see that by its content and its treatment of the content the *Metamorphoses* must have recalled the Roman Alexandrinists, the so called neoteric school of poets. This has lead some scholars to regard Ovid as *Vollender der neoterischen Bestrebungen* [69]; this is true, but probably not the whole truth. It is certain that Ovid's readers, fully aware as they were of all the neoteric elements in the *Metamorphoses,* would have noted the very important relations of the poem with Ennius, who was certainly not in favour with the *cantores Euphorionis* [70], with Lucretius, who apparently had no contact at all with the new poetry, with Horace (though here the relations are more sporadic), who took up a rather unsympathetic attitude to the neoteric school, and—above all—with Vergil, whom nobody would label as an Alexandrinist though his early works were of that kind. No competent reader would fail to recognize that, exactly as Vergil, Ovid did not in any way confine himself to imitating a single literary school or period, Greek or Roman; apparently both of

them were great enough to use very different models and still remain *sui similes*.

One might have expected that the deplorable fact that the works of this circle, except those of Catullus, have almost entirely perished would have caused scholars to be careful in their judgments. But here as elsewhere lack of material seems to invite to general agreement whereas discussion and disagreement is the rule when evidence has been preserved in a more adequate measure. Accordingly, it is generally agreed that Catullus was not only the best of all neoterics but also that he was not quite typical of the movement because of his personal engagement in love and life. This is probably a result of the comforting opinion that what is preserved is what deserves to be preserved. As a matter of fact this theory has nothing to recommend itself except the comfort it gives to lovers of Roman literature. If Catullus was not typical of the neoteric school—and this seems likely enough in view of the fact that normally only comparatively bad poets are "typical" of a literary trend in a narrower sense—why should Calvus, ranked by the ancients along with Catullus, have been more typical? Some of the very few lines of his poems which have survived the ravages of time, mostly because of their linguistic peculiarities, have a tantalizing beauty and a mature simplicity as *e. g.*

> *Et leges sanctas docuit et cara iugavit*
> *corpora conubiis et magnas condidit urbes* [71]
>
> and
>
> *Mens mea dira sibi praedicens omnia vecors* [72].

It seems that recondite learning and formal elaboration were not the only characteristics of Calvus as a poet; it might be added that his oratory is characterized by Quintillian as *gravis et sancta* [73]. The idea that the *Zmyrna* of Cinna was mannered and overelaborated comes from Catullus and not from the three verses that have been preserved. We learn from Catullus that Cinna worked on his poem for nine years before publishing it [74], as was later set up by Horace as a standard [75]. Catullus' compliment seems to have damaged the reputation of Cinna. It is tempting to quote Cicero's humorous sneer at the modernists [76], but the context where he mentions the *cantores Euphorionis* should not be forgotten; evidently, the new poets criticized Ennius as rude and old-fashioned whereas Cicero admired him; but Cicero's attitude is somewhat ambiguous: he translated himself Aratus and wrote a short epic in the Alexandrian manner, the *Alcyones*. Like Ovid he seems to have praised the ancients but conformed to contemporary standards. The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that we should not rashly regard the new poetry as a well-defined entity in Roman literary history. Only this much can confidently be said about this "school": its members have shown a preference for the short form, adopted a critical attitude to what was at that time the classical Roman literature, followed the Alexandrians in choice of subject matter and in their insistence on artistic finish, and deliberately worked to create a contemporaneous standard of Latin poetic diction. And it seems nearer to the truth to maintain that it was for Augustan literature as a whole to accomplish the ultimate efforts of the neoterics rather than for any particular poet among the Augustans.

The loss of the works of Calvus, Cinna, and other poets of that generation makes it impossible to decide with certainty to what extent they were models of reading in relation to the *Metamorphoses;* but there are several quite explicit allusions to Catullus [77] and a considerable number of places where a passage from Catullus is likely to have presented itself more or less vaguely to the mind of Ovid's readers [78]. And out of a total of only twenty lines, all we have of Calvus' poems, there is a line imitated by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses;* in his *Io,* Calvus addressed his heroine by the verse:

> *A virgo infelix herbis pasceris amaris* [79]

and the readers of the *Metamorphoses* would have recognized the correspondence in the description of Io's misery as a cow:

> *frondibus arboreis et amara pascitur herba* [80].

the fact that Vergil, too, imitated Calvus' verse using the first hemistich of it, *A virgo infelix,* twice in his sixth *Eclogue* [81] makes it almost certain that it was generally known; the poets must have supposed their readers to be able to enjoy the "imitation". Moreover, the reason why we have Calvus' verse is exactly the fact that the scholiast of Vergil was aware of the relationship between him and Calvus [82]. But the well-read reader of Ovid would not only remember the verse of Calvus but also Vergil's use of it, and so the sixth *Eclogue,* too, would become a model of reading, and it appears that this model would bear on more than that single verse: the reader would not only observe that in Vergil *infelix virgo,* alludes to *Pasiphae, i. e.* a woman loving a bull, not a girl transformed into a cow and being loved by Jupiter, a god who in another love-affair transformed himself into a bull; and he would enjoy that playful variation; but he would also discover that the song of Silenus in the sixth *Eclogue* is, as a

matter of fact, a song of the same kind as the *Metamorphoses*, beginning philosophically with the creation of the world, continuing mythologically with some respect for chronology and including a passage on Gallus, Vergil's own contemporary. The implication of this is not necessarily that Ovid got the idea of the *Metamorphoses* from Vergil's sixth *Eclogue;* perhaps he did, perhaps not—it is impossible to tell; but to the reader there would be a correspondence to be interpreted as *imitatio* and it seems likely to assume that the poet was himself aware of that—and made use of it.

We have observed that the Greek models of the *Metamorphoses* were not exclusively confined to the Alexandrian period and in the same way it is evident that, unlike the new poets, Ovid imitated archaic Roman literature, especially Ennius, as well as that of the latest generations, and so invited his readers to discover the interplay with Ennius in the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid's own attitude to Ennius is known from his catalogue of poets:

> *Ennius arte carens animosique Accius oris*
> *casurum nullo tempore nomen habent* [83]

—a couplet to which the verses about Callimachus in the same poem should be, but not always are, compared. Ovid did not change his evaluation; in a mature age he wrote:

> *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis* [84].

His opinion of Ennius seems, then, to have been much the same as that of Cicero: his poetic qualities were great and his own, his deficiencies those of his age. We may be sure that Ovid's readers knew their Ennius. The *Annals* had replaced the Latin *Odyssey* of Livius Andronicus and were themselves replaced by the *Aeneid* as a school-text, a fact which in the course of time proved fatal to the old national epic poem. But as the *Aeneid* was published after Vergil's death in 19 B. C., Ovid's contemporaries must have read the *Annals* by their *grammatici*. And even if the *Aeneid* was patronized by the government, it can hardly have replaced the *Annals* in the schools immediately after its publication, seeing that conservatism in the choice of texts seems to be one of the most constant features of school-teaching at least until these last years [85]. So most of the generation after Ovid probably knew Ennius from their school-days. When Ovid takes over a whole line of Ennius his readers would immediately discover it. Addressing Jupiter Mars declares that time has come to make Romulus a god in accordance with his promise:

> *tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum*
> *(nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi)*
> *"unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli"*
> *dixisti: rata sit verborum summa tuorum* [86].

The words of Jupiter quoted by Mars are taken over from Ennius [87], and the reader then suddenly discovers on what occasion Jupiter made his promise; it was, of course, in the *concilium deorum* in the first book of the *Annals*. And he would, I think, find it amusing that the god of war, when quoting Ennius, takes the trouble to announce that he is quite sure to remember the exact wording. He knows his Ennius as well as Ovid and his readers; and not only that: by leaving out the *templa* of Ennius he modernizes the promise according to the more refined poetic standards of Ovid's generation. There is an anecdote that Vergil once said he was gathering gold from Ennius' dungheap: *sese aurum colligere ex stercore Ennii* [88], a statement which may cover the actual procedure but cannot be said to betray any high degree of *pietas* towards the father of Roman literature. Ovid would probably not have used that expression but that he found things worthy of imitation in Ennius is proved by his phrase *iubar aureus extulerat sol* [88] which, as Norden rightly remarks [90], we would suppose to have an Ennian prototype even if it had not by a mere chance been transmitted: *simul aureus exoritur sol* [91]. More often, however, the Ennian goldpieces in the *Metamorphoses* are those which had already been reburnished by Lucretius or Vergil or both of them. One of the examples collected by Zingerle [92] will be sufficient to illustrate this point:

Enn. *Ann*. XVI, 8 (V.): *Tunc timido manat ex corpore sudor.*
Lucr. VI, 944: *Manat item nobis e toto corpore sudor.*
Verg. *Aen*. III, 175: *Tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor.*
Ov. *Met*. IX, 173: *Caeruleusque fluit toto de corpore sudor.*

It is correspondences of this kind [93] which make the reader feel that Roman literature is not a series of works to be appreciated individually, but an organic structure in which the single elements are tied together in a strong network of interrelations, varying from fundamental ideas and attitudes to stylistic *minutiae*.

Although no reader would probably expect to find in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* any serious philosophical engagement of the kind which pervades the sublime poem *De Rerum Natura* by Lucretius, he would easily have seen that there is a considerable number of reminiscences of Lucretius in

the *Metamorphoses*. Lucretius appears to have been an unlucky man; it seems certain from internal evidence that what drove him to write his poem was not literary ambition but a fervent dedication to the truth he found in the philosophy of Epicurus. Yet his books were not, apparently, read so much because of their philosophical message as they were appreciated as fine poetry. He himself compares his task with that of a doctor putting honey on the rim of a cup in order to make children swallow the medicine; but there was so much honey that most readers contented themselves with that and left the medicine alone; among these were, for all we know about him, Ovid and, probably, most of his admirers as well. So, when Ovid starts with a "philosophical" account of the creation and towards the end of his poem brings in the long speech of Pythagoras, this is probably due to artistic aims rather than philosophical intentions. As remarked by Wilkinson [94] the precise pedigree of his eclectic cosmology cannot now be determined, but it smacks most of Posidonian Stoicism and it is by no means consistent: Ovid, like the Book of Genesis, presents us with alternative versions and leaves it at that. But both neo-Stoicism and neo-Pythagoreanism were popular philosophies of the day and therefore likely to attract the readers. The modern idea that Ovid was a devote neo-Pythagorean and that the speech of Pythagoras is a clue to a philosophical interpretation of the poem does not seem to have occurred to ancient readers. From a literary point of view, however, the Pythagorean passage had the double advantage of giving an apparent justification to the idea of metamorphosis and of being a specimen of a philosophy in vogue at Rome. But neither Ovid himself nor, what is more important, his readers would have regarded the philosophical passages in the *Metamorphoses* as anything but poetry [95]. And as it was the appointed lot of Lucretius' work to be regarded in a similar way it is no wonder at all that we find this fervent Epicurean imitated and recalled in both the "Stoic" and the "Pythagorean" passages in the *Metamorphoses*. So, the very first verse of the *Creation* in Ovid's poem makes Lucretius ring in the ears of the readers [96]. And, as Brooks Otis remarks, Pythagoras is a Lucretius, and his speech is introduced as an answer to Numa's question *de rerum natura* [97]. The references to Lucretius in the passage *Met.* XV, 143 ff. are unmistakable. Further, the feeling of being saved oneself and able to look down upon the poor wretches who are not is expressed by Pythagoras in verses strongly reminiscent of Lucretius [98]. The address made to the unsaved part of mankind:

> *O genus attonitum gelidae formidine mortis* [99]

has a model in Lucretius:

> *O genus infelix hominum* [100].

Pythagoras' address to mankind and his ensuing question, too:

> *Quid Styga, quid tenebras et nomina vana timetis*
> *materiem vatum falsique pericula mundi?*

might very well, as observed by Wilkinson [101], have been written by Lucretius himself. As a matter of fact, the only difference seems to be that the gospel of Pythagoras is exactly the opposite as that of Lucretius: not dissolution, but immortality of the soul. Even this very point is expressed in a "Lucretian" phrase:

> *Omnia mutantur, nihil interit* [102].

Owing to this somewhat ironical attitude of Ovid towards his model in the speech of Pythagoras, and to its "rhetorical" composition, sentences, and conceits, the passage is extremely Ovidian, and the effect rests partly on the contrast between model and performance. That the philosophical passages must have been understood as *tours de force*, or perhaps as specimens of Ovid's peculiar illusionism, an ironical balancing between apparent seriousness and flippant elusiveness, seems to me to be evident from the fact that no greater contrast can be thought of than that between serious philosophy and the free and phantastic narrative of the *Metamorphoses* [103]. Sometimes this contrast is made explicit with a humourous effect as when in the moment before he strikes the degenerate human race with his thunderbolt Jupiter suddenly remembers his philosophical school-knowledge:

> *esse quoque in fatis reminiscitur adfore tempus,*
> *quo mare, quo tellus correptaque regia caeli*
> *ardeat et mundi moles obsessa laboret* [104].

The knowledge itself is commonplace to every educated reader, but by the wording it becomes evident that in this case the text-book was Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* [105]. Fundamentally, the effect of this correspondence is of the same nature as Mars' play on Ennius, mentioned above.—The story about Phaethon's unlucky drive with the Sun's horses is briefly told by Lucretius [106]. There are several reminiscences of these few verses in the broad treatment of the story in the *Metamorphoses* [107]. One of these contains an interesting variation. In Lucretius the almighty father becomes angry at the disorder and strikes Phaethon with sudden lightning:

At pater omnipotens ira tum percitus acri
magnanimum Phaethonta repenti fulminis ictu
deturbavit equis in terram.

Ovid's version is different: Jupiter has to be exhorted by a long and pityful speech of Mother Earth; then, finally, he decides for action:

At pater omnipotens, superos testatus et ipsum
qui dederat currus, nisi opem ferat, omnia fato
interitura gravi, summam petit arduus arcem,
unde solet nubes latis inducere terris,
unde movet tonitrus vibrataque fulmina iactat.
Sed neque quas posset terris inducere nubes
tunc habuit nec quos caelo demitteret imbres.
Intonat et dextra libratum fulmen ab aure
misit in aurigam pariterque animaque rotisque [108]
expulit et saevis compescuit ignibus ignes [109].

Here, there is some contrast between the epithet *omnipotens* and the fact that Jupiter, like a constitutional monarch, secures a kind of parliamentary backing for his move [110]. Besides he is put into the embarrassing position of having no clouds available. But finally he succeeds in striking Phaethon. The presence of Lucretius in the *Metamorphoses* is not, then, confined to passages dealing with philosophical problems. Also the famous description of the plague in Lucretius' sixth book is imitated by Ovid [111]. To mention another example, Ovid takes over from Lucretius certain physical or technological similes as that of melting wax [112], of rain hardening into hail [113], and of the glowing and melting of leaden bullets by the friction of the air: Lucretius describes this phaenomenon [114] in his sixth book:

ut omnia motu
percalefacta vides ardescere, plumbea vero
glans etiam longo cursu volvenda liquescit [115].

In Ovid the reader is told that Romulus is purified on his way to the heavens above

ceu lata plumbea funda
missa solet medio glans intabescere caelo [116].

Some readers at least would have remembered that the simile had been used before by Ovid, but in an entirely different context: when Mercurius

is flying over Athens and discovers the beautiful Herse among the *canephoroe* he is consumed by the fires of erotic passion:

aethere pendens
non secus exarsit, quam cum Balearica plumbum
funda iacit: volat illud et incandescit eundo
et quos non habuit, sub nubibus invenit ignes [117].

Also here the model is Lucretius: he illustrates one of his explanations of lightning by the following verses:

non alia longe ratione ac plumbea saepe
fervida fit glans in cursu, cum multa rigoris
corpora dimittens ignem concepit in auris [118].

While we are dealing with lead, the famous simile in the *Pyramus and Thisbe* [119] of the broken waterpipe is decidedly Lucretian [120] in its tone and wording, and the humourous effect seems to be brought about by the somewhat grotesque contrast between the materialistic simile and the pathetic *illustrandum*. There are many other relations between Ovid and Lucretius, but at present I shall confine myself to referring the reader to the numerous examples of poetical phrases and combinations of words common to both poets in the collection of Zingerle [121].

We have now arrived at the Augustan literature. The statement that there are many correspondences with elegy, with Propertius and Tibullus in the *Metamorphoses* is not likely to surprise anybody. However, since R. Heinze the relation between elegy and epic poetry or, to be more cautious, Ovid's peculiar brand of epic poetry has been the subject of some discussion. As elegy—in spite of all differences between the individual elegists—is a rather restricted genre, highly stylized in motives and expressions, it might prove profitable to treat the genre as a unity *vis à vis* the *Metamorphoses* although the elegists have their own individuality within the frames of the genre itself. And as Ovid was himself an elegist it would be almost impossible to specify what passages in the *Metamorphoses* the readers would have considered as imitated directly from the other elegists and what passages as having passed through Ovid's own elegies—if, indeed, the readers took trouble at all to try to discern the source rather than content themselves with recognizing this or that passage in the *Metamorphoses* as having been modelled on some elegy. The question of elegiac elements in the *Metamorphoses* will be touched upon in the next chapter [122].

Although Ovid never wrote epodes, odes, satires, or moral epistles, and

Horace never elegies, tragedy, or narrative poems, readers would find a rather great number of *imitationes* (a term which here and elsewhere embraces *immutationes*) of Horace in the works of Ovid and hence also in the *Metamorphoses*. In a very conspicuous place in the poem the imitation is obvious, in the epilogue:

> *Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis*
> *nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.*
> *cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius,*
> *ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi;*
> *parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis*
> *astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum,*
> *quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,*
> *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,*
> *siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam* [123].

The model is, as everybody knows and knew, Horace's famous ode, his personal epilogue to the first collection of his lyrics:

> *Exegi monumentum aere perennius*
> *regalique situ pyramidum altius,*
> *quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens*
> *posset diruere aut innumerabilis*
> *annorum series et fuga temporum.*
> *Non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei*
> *vitabit Libitinam: usque ego postera*
> *crescam laude recens, dum Capitolium*
> *scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex* [124].

It is not necessary to point out the similarities; ancient readers would have discovered them at a glance without any commentary to refer them to Horace. But they would also at once have felt the immense difference in situation and background more than most modern readers. The meaning of a statement depends not only upon what is actually said but also by whom. By his own leaning and by the favours of Maecenas Horace was to some extent the official poet of the new *régime*, and not only in his own eyes but also in the opinion of the government the *Odes* were an extraordinary achievement, giving splendour and fame to the new age emerging under the new rule. He was entitled to pride and glory—even if the *Odes*, while praised by the most competent critics, were not finding favour at once with the majority of the reading public. However, every reader knew

that Ovid had never been patronized by the court, that he was exiled on the charge that by his writing he had worked against the policy of the palace. Besides, his poems, although criticized for lack of seriousness and sometimes taste, had always been extremely successful among the readers. So, I imagine that ancient readers would not have failed to see the note of defiance in the words *nec Iovis ira*, to which there is no equivalent in Horace [125]; it is evident from the preceding eulogy of Augustus that *Iupiter* refers to the supreme power, the Emperor being on Earth what Jupiter is in Heaven; yet, this power is not unlimited: the Emperor might destroy the poet but the poem will defy all his power [126]. And after having made Caesar immortal and promised immortality to his son, the Emperor, Ovid frankly claims that he has won it already for himself. Another point is that Ovid seems to oppose his own indisputable popularity to the lack of official recognition and the judgment of the readers to that of the critics: *ore legar populi*. Although there is an element of banter in this, Ovid did not try to detract from the fame of his older contemporary; in his youth he had heard him and in his exile he recalled his experience with pleasure:

> *Et tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures,*
> *dum ferit Ausonia carmina culta lyra* [127].

It is probably not by chance that these verses refer to Orazio lirico; the evidence collected by Zingerle [128] shows that among the works of Horace the *Odes* are by far the most frequently imitated by Ovid. And sensitive readers would have observed that in the *Metamorphoses* there is a fine implicit compliment to the lyric poet. When Orpheus entreats Pluto and Persephone to release his Eurydice, one of the arguments in his song, which is accompanied by the lyre, recalls a famous passage from the *Odes* [129]. Thus Horace is placed on a level with the bard who made stones and trees move by his song. And the description of the effect of Orpheus' song in Hades:

> *talia dicentem nervosque ad verba moventem*
> *exsangues flebant animae; nec Tantalus undam*
> *captavit refugam, stupuitque Ixionis orbis,*
> *nec carpsere iecur volucres, urnisque vacarunt*
> *Belides, inque tuo sedisti, Sisyphe, saxo* [130]

has its closest model in Horace—and it is an additional charm that the effect upon the tormented sinners is exactly the opposite:

Quin et Ixion Tityosque voltu
risit invito; stetit urna paullum
sicca, dum grato Danai puellas
carmine mulces [131].

To mention only one more instance where readers would have felt a correspondence between the *Metamorphoses* and Horace, Ovid in his description of the paradoxical consequences of the flood elaborates on the Horatian verses:

omne cum Proteus pecus egit altos
visere montis
piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo,
nota quae sedes fuerat columbis,
et superiecto pavidae natarunt
aequore dammae [132].

The fact that Seneca the philosopher criticizes Ovid for making fun of the destruction of the World [133] may be used to show an essential difference between Ovid and Horace: whether we think that Seneca's verdict is fair to Ovid or not, it would be impossible to say that Horace is not serious; yet, there is apparently only a difference in degree between Ovid and Horace. But if the reader tries to take Ovid seriously, the passage becomes tasteless; accordingly the passage should not be taken quite seriously; the reader is not supposed to be shocked but to enjoy the curious mingling of phantasy and realism—and the interplay of model and performance.

No model, however, was more important to Ovid and his readers than Vergil, especially the *Aeneid*. As a matter of fact Vergil is ubiquitous [134] in the *Metamorphoses*. It seems impossible that he should not be that. But the *Aeneid* was a unique achievement which could by no means be repeated. It may seem to us that the *Aeneid* had to be written at the time it was written and by Vergil; this may be due to the fact that we cannot think of Latin literature without an *Aeneid*. We sometimes forget that a literary work is always unpredictable. But once the *Aeneid* was written, there was no room for other "*Aeneids*". In its own field a classical masterpiece is the final word, allowing no alterations, subtractions, or additions. It is reasonable to assume that Ovid saw this and therefore abstained from any competition with the *Aeneid* on the conditions of that poem; whatever the reason may have been he made his own poem as different as possible from the *Aeneid* in subject matter, composition, style and scope.

Only by this procedure did it become possible to exploit the model without being crushed by it. And the *Aeneid* had to be a model, it could not be ignored by the poet and it evidently did not have any chance of being ignored by his readers. It is impossible to think that a grand-scale epic poem, published only one generation after the *Aeneid* should not have been compared to the *Aeneid* by its readers. The *Metamorphoses* could stand such comparison only by the fact that the poem defies direct comparison. The *Metamorphoses* recall the *Aeneid* almost everywhere, but the Vergilian element seems always to be variated, surrounded by a different context, and given a new meaning so that the result is extremely Ovidian; we have seen how Ovid utilized Lucretius and Horace in a similar way and the procedure may be regarded as typical for Ovid's way of imitation as a whole; but in the case of Vergil it was more necessary because imitation in a more restricted sense of the word would inevitably have fallen flat in comparison with the model. In a fine paper Franz Bömer [135] has demonstrated how Ovid solved the problem of making use of the Vergilian epic language, which was to him and his readers the absolute standard, and yet using in freely in his own way and to serve his own aims. Bömer analyses the passage in the Metamorphoses dealing with the meeting of Aeneas with the Sibyl:

litora Cumarum vivacisque antra Sibyllae
intrat et, ad manes veniat per Averna paternos,
orat; at illa diu vultum tellure moratum
erexit tandemque deo furibunda recepto
"Magna petis" dixit "vir factis maxime, cuius
dextera per ferrum est, pietas spectata per ignes.
Pone tamen, Troiane, metum! Potiere petitis
Elysiasque domos et regna novissima mundi
me duce cognosces simulacraque cara parentis:
invia virtuti nulla est via!". Dixit et auro
fulgentem ramum in silva Iunonis Avernae
monstravit iussitque suo divellere trunco [136]

and among other things draws attention to the fact that in the *Metamorphoses* there is hardly any trace of the solemnity with which the meeting is surrounded in the *Aeneid:* the *arces* of Apollo, the *lucus Triviae* and the description of the shrine, the sacrifice claimed by the Sibyl, her prophecy, the ritual of burying Misenus, the wonderful finding of the golden twig, and the sacrifice to the chthonic deities before the κατάβασις. Ovid's Aeneas knocks on the door, asks for permission to visit the Underworld,

obtains it, and receives the golden twig—almost as a ticket. This may perhaps be regarded as a profanation: *Profanierung* is the term used by Bömer [137]. But that is not the whole truth. The paraphrase given above is not the only possible one; it unduly underlines the element of parody. It might equally well be maintained that Ovid simply gives a synopsis of the first part of the sixth *Aeneid:* Aeneas goes to the cave, asks the Sibyl, and is allowed to visit Hades. A synopsis has to be short and it could not, without lapsing into pedantry, be loaded with references to all the scenes in Vergil, especially when these would automatically occur to the readers. And it would be tactless to try to tell things which Vergil had told with such perfection before. The two interpretations implied by the two paraphrases might be said to be complementary to one another although they seem to exclude each other. It should not be forgotten that no paraphrase can do justice to the totality of a text. Ovid is neither a parodist nor an unreserved follower of Vergil, or rather: he is both. His attitude is ironical and accordingly the reader has a rather ambivalent experience, vacillating between the neither–nor and the both–and [138]. The *résumé* of Vergil continues in the following four verses:

Paruit Aeneas et formidabilis Orci
vidit opes atavosque suos umbramque senilem
magnaimi Anchisae: didicit quoque iura locorum,
quaeque novis essent adeunda pericula bellis

and the same ambivalence can be noted here: the synopsis of the main part of the sixth *Aeneid* is correct without being pedantic; but is Aeneas not regarded discretely as a kind of tourist, too? But then comes a conspicuous deviation from Vergil:

Inde ferens lassos adverso tramite passus
cum duce Cumaea mollit sermone laborem,
dumque iter horrendum per opaca crepuscula carpit,

Aeneas makes a compliment to the Sibyl: she will always be a goddess to him, and so provokes her to tell her story. Vergil, as every reader knew, simply makes Aeneas use the backdoor, the ivory gate, and it is easy to see that any description of the ἀνάβασις would weaken the description of Aeneas' visit to the Underworld. But some readers at least would probably feel a certain contrast between the difficult circumstances involved in getting him down and the easiness with which he is brought up again, especially when the verses *Aen.* VI, 126 ff. are remembered. Ovid discretly draws attention to this point by filling the gap. Rosa Lamacchia [139] arrives at the conclusion that Ovid may be called *il primo critico di Virgilio,* opposing his own rationalism to the Vergilian symbolism. No doubt, the tension between rationalistic approach and phantastic subject matter is one of the constituents of Ovidian poetry in the *Metamorphoses;* but it might be more correct to say that Ovid is asserting his independence of his predecessor. The point is not that Ovid thought that Vergil should have written the *Aeneid* otherwise than he did—he is very unlikely to have thought so—,but that he did not in his own poem use the *Aeneid* on a Vergilian basis, almost as Vergil himself did not use Homer on Homeric conditions. What complicates the case of Ovid is his irony, allowing him at the same time to escape totally from Vergil and follow him closely [140]. So in this case Ovid humorously, and rationalistically, implies that Aeneas and the Sibyl could not possibly have been silent the whole way up, and then he goes on to tell what they said and what Vergil had left out of account. And that is the Ovidian mythological lovestory about the Sibyl herself. In this passage of the *Metamorphoses* interest is focused upon the person of the Sibyl and not upon the mission of Aeneas. The procedure is somewhat analogous to the third *Heroid,* where the main plot of the *Iliad* is reduced to form the background of Briseis' passion.

In the paper mentioned above Franz Bömer demonstrates in detail that Ovid is very careful not to take over Vergilian expressions or *iuncturae* without giving them another context or another meaning. Vergil uses the adjective *furibunda* about Dido [141], to denote the madness of love, and about Amata [142], to denote the fury inspired by Alecto's snake, but he does not use it in the description of the Sibyl's *divinus furor* as Ovid does. It might be added that the epithet is found in the *Metamorphoses* about Scylla Nisi [143] in the moment where Minos sets sail without her; the identity of the epithet tends to underline the immense difference between Dido and Scylla as characters and between their reactions while drawing attention to the very similarity of their situation. In Roman literature the *locus classicus* of the *divinus furor* of a *vates* was no doubt the description of the Sibyl in the *Aeneid;* the passage is imitated by Ovid in a wholly different context, viz. about Ocyrrhoë, and—as observed by Bömer [144]—Ovid uses the "terminology" of Vergil in these matters, but carefully avoids to repeat his model; by the words:

vaticinos concepit mente furores [145]

the reader is referred to the model: the term used in the *Aeneid* about the Sibyl is exactly *furor* [146]. But the *iunctura, concepit mente furores,* is

not found in Vergil's description of the Sibyl; it is, however, Vergilian: in the fourth book of the *Aeneid* it is said about Anna, unknowingly preparing the pyre of Dido, that she failed to see how deeply wounded her sister was:

> *nec tantos mente furores*
> *concipit* [147].

It should be noted that Ovid is here more Vergilian than Vergil himself in the sense that he goes back to the *vis propria verbi,* taking *concipere mente* in a literal sense, whereas Vergil uses it in its normal tropical sense [148]. But this is not all that can be said on *furor* and *furibundus* in Vergil and Ovid. Just as Vergil's epithet of Dido is used by Ovid in the "analogous" story about Scylla Nisi, so the reader might find out that the epithet of Amata in the *Aeneid* recurs in the *Metamorphoses* in a similar way: telling the story of Athamas and Ino Ovid makes Juno, who hates the whole house of Cadmus, go to Hades [149] and tell the *furia* Tisiphone to exercise her sinister powers over Athamas and Ino in order to ruin their happiness, and Tisiphone does as she is told [150]. In Vergil Juno, who hates the Trojans, calls the *furia* Alecto and tells her to madden Amata in order to prevent, or at least postpone, the marriage between Aeneas and Lavinia; and Alecto does so. The plot of the two stories is the same, and there are many references in Ovid to Vergil, but always variations and often these reminiscences point to other passages in Vergil than the story of Amata. Moreover, the relative weight of the components of the stories is different; for instance the description of Hades is far more detailed in Ovid than in Vergil, but the monologue of Juno is much shorter. And the most important point, the whole ethos and bearing of the episodes is completely different in the two poems. Nevertheless, on the very point of the καταστροφή Ovid overtly takes over the Vergilian epithet *without* variation: Athamas becomes *furibundus* [151] in exactly the same sense as Amata becomes *furibunda.* To make the picture of Ovid's use of Vergil's *furibundus* complete it may be noted that Ovid uses it twice to describe *unnatural* love [152] and once of natural love [153] as Vergil does about Dido, but in Ovid there is the very important difference that the person who is *furibundus* by his unhappy love is—the cyclops Polyphemus!

Bömer [154] has shown by his analysis of the relation between the Vergilian locus—which itself goes back to Homer—of the shipwrecked man praising the happy ones to whom it was granted to die on solid earth, between the Vergilian phrase *memor ira,* and between the Vergilian

epithet *clivosus* and their use in Ovid, that there is a general trend for these things to lose weight and gravity in the hands of Ovid: that the motives are used as well-established *loci,* that the *epitheta necessaria* are reduced to *epitheta ornantia,* and that the sense of the words is expanded in a way which makes them less intense. This is perhaps not very surprising in itself as no reader would probably fail to see that the *Metamorphoses* are written in a very much lighter key than the *Aeneid.* But it is very important to realize that Ovid in general and the poet of the *Metamorphoses* in particular is completely free, not only in his use of his predecessor's subject matter, but also in his use of the Vergilian epic language [155]. Nevertheless Bömer's conclusion has to be modified to the opposite effect. Sometimes, as we have seen, Ovid is in a sense more Vergilian than Vergil when we compare his imitation to the model; the readers, however, would never forget that Ovid is Ovid and not Vergil. And, as the analysis of the respective use of *furibundus* in the two poems may have shown, the use Ovid makes of the word is completely determined by that of Vergil in the paradoxical sense that Ovid is always quite different even when the epithet is used in—apparently—analogous stories at the "same" points about heroes in the "same" tragic situations. Bömer justly observes that what is generally termed as "das ovidische *ludere*" is closely related to this attitude. But it should not be forgotten that Ovid's *lusus* is not only burlesque and lack of sincerity; he is neither a parodist nor a frivole poet—or that alone. His *lusus* is an act of balance between seriousness and levity, between respect and disrespect, between escaping from Vergil and following him. By this attitude he managed to avoid the Scylla of becoming an epigone and the Charybdis of being silenced by the very perfection of his model. And what Seneca brands as *ineptiae pueriles* in Ovid is not the *lusus* as such but cases where Ovid—according to Seneca—loses the balance.

The book on the relations between the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid* has not yet been written [156] and it is with a very good reason that v. Albrecht [157] draws attention to this important need, seeing that a careful collection and interpretation of all the relevant material would no doubt replace "die Schablone vom "gefühlvollen Vergil" und dem "kalten Artisten Ovid" durch ein nuancierteres Bild". It should be noted that study of the *Metamorphoses* has some importance for the understanding of the *Aeneid* and not only *vice versa,* as no reader, once he had read the *Metamorphoses,* could possibly have read the *Aeneid* as readers did before the publication of the *Metamorphoses.* Literary works are not only influenced by their predecessors but they may very well themselves be more or

less transformed by their successors if these are actually operating as models of reading.

The survey given in this chapter of Ovid's models may—in spite of the fact that material for almost a whole library has been pressed together in a few pages with no pretensions whatsoever of completeness—justify some preliminary conclusions. If it can be assumed that the readers of Ovid had the same qualitative literary background as he had himself—and that assumption should have a fair chance of being valid as the *Metamorphoses* actually did find favour with the readers—then the nature of their appreciation of the poem must have followed the lines indicated in the present chapter. Quantitatively the literary background has no doubt varied very much, from almost complete knowledge of Greek and Latin literature to almost nothing—if, that is, persons who know the *Aeneid* can be said to have read almost nothing. But fundamentally readers with such quantitatively different qualifications would discover the same interrelation between the *Metamorphoses* and its models—or, in the case of those who knew Vergil only, its model. However, the interplay between model and performance is only one among the factors determining the experience of reading the *Metamorphoses*. The poem requires a certain minimum of familiarity with the Greco-Roman mythology, but it is probably not too unsafe to believe that in Ovid's time even the less educated Romans had a knowledge of mythology which can be compared to the knowledge everybody had of the Bible and Holy Legends some generations ago [158]. Even if one of these rather unqualified readers should have read the *Metamorphoses* as his first book at all, he would probably have found it entertaining, as young undergraduates do nowadays, simply because Ovid is a good narrator; but the literary refinements and the subtle virtuosity of varying the models would have been wasted upon him, in much the same way as the irony in Hans Andersen's fairy-tales is wasted on children—a fact which does not imply that their experience is in itself less valuable or true. The average Roman reader, however, would be qualified to discover at least some examples of interplay with a model. And we may confidently believe that to the majority of the readers Ovid was already a name when they started unrolling the *Metamorphoses*.

III
The Ovidian Context

It is certain, then, that what the reader knew, or rather, perhaps, what he thought he knew of the letters and life of Ovid would influence his experience of the *Metamorphoses*. The different works of a poet always tend to form a complex unity: we feel that the production of one man could not be made up of entirely isolated pieces, but must follow certain organic laws. So—as it may have appeared from the previous chapter—ancient literature in general and Roman literature in particular should not be regarded by the reader only as a sum of *monumenta* but also as a living structure in which the single works are determined by inheritance and environment: On the one hand they retain their individuality on the other they exert influence upon and are in turn modified and transformed by other works throughout their lifetime, *i. e.* the period during which they are read. To use an analogy from another field of art to illustrate this point, the effect of *Palazzo Massimo alle colonne* in Rome upon the beholders—*i. e.*, in a sense, its architectonic structure—is now influenced by the broadness of *Corso Vittorio Emmanuele II.*, which itself receives some of its character from that noble building which is now forming part of an architectonic milieu including the church of *Sant' Andrea della Valle* and *Palazzo Farnesina;* but before the *Corso Vittorio Emanuele* was made a century ago the effect of the façade was quite different, as it could only be seen in its full height from the narrow *Via del Paradiso* of which the open *loggia* on the ground floor seemed to form a continuation; and the curving of the façade was parallel to the opposite side of the narrow *Via della Valle*.—

What holds good of Roman literature as a whole is also true of a poet's literary production: however different the individual poems may be, they always remain expressions of the same mind. We should not, however, rashly identify what appears from the poems to be the mind of the poet and what was actually the mind of the man. Poets are prone to put on magic garbs, making themselves either invisible or unrecognizable, and to

CLASSICA ET MEDIAEVALIA · DISSERTATIONES X

CHANGING FORMS

STUDIES IN THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

BY

OTTO STEEN DUE

GYLDENDAL
COPENHAGEN 1974